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Introduction
This submission is in support of the New Zealand Captive Insurance Association’s submission to
the Reserve Bank on the Issues Paper outlining scope of the review of the Insurance (Prudential
Supervision) Act 2010. Our submission is from the perspective of an organisation who has an
established captive insurance subsidiary company, Unison Insurance Limited (UIL).

Background
Unison Networks Limited (Unison) and its subsidiaries (together the Group) provide
electricity distribution and line function services to around 110,600 customers, as well as
fibre optic network interconnections and related services throughout the Hawke’s Bay, Taupo
and Rotorua regions. The Unison Group is wholly owned by the Hawke’s Bay Power
Consumers’ Trust on behalf of Hawke’s Bay electricity consumers. There is currently a very
limited insurance retail market place for what are known as “T & D assets” (transmission and
distribution equipment including poles, pole-mounted assets, wires, and underground cables). To
address this gap, in 2009, Unison established UIL, as Unison’s captive insurer, in order to provide
cost effective cover for Unison’s uninsured risk.

Unison, as a ‘Lifeline Utility’, has an obligation under the Civil Defence and Emergency
Management Act 2002, amongst other matters, to ensure we are able to function to the fullest
extent possible, during and after an emergency. The establishment of UIL, is a measure
undertaken by Unison to assist the meeting of this obligation by providing a fund to spread the
costs of a catastrophic event over time, rather than recover costs from consumers at the time of
the event. UIL provides a vehicle to better manage Unison Group’s risk compared to similar
entities where T & D assets remain uninsured.

Response to Issues Paper
From our perspective the Reserve Bank’s regulation of the UIL as a Captive Insurer imposes
significant compliance costs with no discernible benefit to UIL, its parent (Unison), stakeholders in
the general insurance industry or the general public. And that these compliance costs are
disproportionate for a captive which was established to manage a risk which was initially uninsurable in the general insurance market.

In particular, we believe the following compliance requirements significantly increase compliance costs:

- Requirement to comply with the Financial Market Conduct Act.
- Requirement to be an Issuer.
- Requirement to complete a semi-annual filing.

The requirement to comply with the Financial Market Conduct Act and to be an Issuer has significant time and cost to the preparation and audit of the annual and semi-annual financial statements. Additionally, the requirement to complete a semi-annual filing again significantly increases compliance costs without providing any benefit to the captive, its parent, stakeholders in the general insurance industry or general public. By virtue of UIL being a captive, there is a tight relationship between UIL and Unison, its the parent company. Such that both parties have exactly the same understanding of the nature of risk faced by Unison. Unison has a full and complete understanding of the financial position of its captive, including its ability to meet claims.

The position of a captive insurance company and its parent is completely different to a person or entity procuring external insurance. There is not the asymmetry of information which justifies prudential supervision of general, third party insurers which warrants the Reserve Bank's prudential supervision and monitoring.

We strongly believe that the obligations placed on captives do not enhance the management of the captive, or the parent company's understanding of the captive. The result is significant compliance costs imposed on a captive with no added benefits. The result is that expenditure on compliance obligations detracts from the build-up of capital in UIL and therefore reduces the extent of insurance cover available.

Accordingly, we strongly question the extent of regulation of captive insurers and would request that Reserve Bank carries out, and justifies, on a cost benefit basis regulation applied to captive insurers. Fundamentally, the Reserve Bank needs to establish what market failure or asymmetry of information exists between a Captive and its Parent that would be resolved by regulation, in light of the transparency of information between Captives and their Parents.

We would be happy to discuss the arrangements we have in place at Unison and UIL if that would assist the Reserve Bank’s understanding.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Nathan Strong
GENERAL MANAGER, BUSINESS ASSURANCE